



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. APPLICATION NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR CONFIRMATION NO. FILING DATE 09/490,553 01/25/2000 Jeffrey A. Morgan 10992213-1 7289 7590 22879 09/02/2003 HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY EXAMINER P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD LIN, KENNY S INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER DATE MAILED: 09/02/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			Ose
Advisory Action	Application N	Applicant(s)	
	09/490,553	MORGAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kenny Lin	2154	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a	ppears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence add	lress
THE REPLY FILED 13 August 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of App Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	o avoid abandonment of th : (1) a timely filed amendn beal (with appeal fee); or (nis application. A proper repl nent which places the applica	y to a ation in
PERIOD FOR	REPLY [check either a) of	or b)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the ma			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of the no event, however, will the statutory period for reply exp ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY V 706.07(f).	oire later than SIX MONTHS fror	n the mailing date of the final rejecti	ion.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). the entire been filed is the date for purposes of determining the periode under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the 6 imely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 3	od of extension and the corresp e of the shortened statutory peri- Office later than three months a	onding amount of the fee. The app od for reply originally set in the final	ropriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellar 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR)			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	d because:		
(a) They raise new issues that would require full	rther consideration and/or	search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Not	te below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	on in better form for appea	al by materially reducing or si	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cand	celing a corresponding nu	mber of finally rejected claim	ıs.
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rej	jection(s):		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) work canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	uld be allowable if submitt	ted in a separate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request application in condition for allowance because:		een considered but does NO	T place the
 The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered by raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 	pecause it is not directed s	SOLELY to issues which wer	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims	ent(s) a) will not be ent s would be rejected is prov	ered or b) $igties$ will be entered a vided below or appended.	and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follow	vs:		
Claim(s) allowed: none.			
Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-35</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>none</u> .			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on	_is a) approved or b)[disapproved by the Exam	iner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stater			
		2 10	
		Karrel Can	
		ZAŘNÍ MAUNG PRIMARY EXAMINER	

Application/Control Number: 09/490,553

Art Unit: 2154

1. The request for reconsideration has been entered and considered but does not overcome the rejection because:

- a. Applicant argues that (1) Daswani does not disclose or suggest the client module,(2) Daswani does not disclose or suggest the web access module (3) Daswani does not disclose or suggest the render system.
- b. As to point (1), the cited area clearly pointed out that requests may be registered from a PDA where the PDA is inherently known to contain a client module for sending the requests. Daswani also disclosed in the background of the invention to access to a selected Internet web page (col.1, lines 35-48, col.2, lines 21-37). Daswani specifically pointed out that the "data" is typically presented in the form of a WEB page (col.2, lines 35-37). Hence, the "Internet-based data" and "reformatted data" disclosed in Daswani reference can be of web page itself as well as the contents of the web page.
- c. As to point (2), Daswani disclosed in the background to transmit the web page itself to allow access to the web page (col.1, lines 35-48, col.2, lines 21-37).
 Daswani specifically pointed out that the "data" is typically presented in the form of a WEB page (col.2, lines 35-37).
- d. As to point (3), Daswani disclosed the render system to render the web page (col.2, lines 21-37). Daswani specifically pointed out that the "data" is typically presented in the form of a WEB page (col.2, lines 35-37).